

MEETING AGENDA
Meeting #36
Port Botany Community Consultative Committee

Location: Online – zoom link as sent in the calendar meeting invitation
Date: Tuesday, 23 August 2022
Time: 5.30 pm - 7.00 pm

Attendees	
<p>Community members John Burgess (JB) Peter Fagan (PF) Patrick Medway (PM-BCC) – Bayside Chamber of Commerce Charles Abela (CA) Paul Pickering (PP)</p> <p>Council representatives Bronwyn Englaro (BE) – Randwick City Council Clare Harley (CH) – Bayside Council</p> <p>Business representatives Sam Steel (SS) – Patrick Karen Jones (KJ) – Opal Michael Martin (MM) – Vopak Mark Walker (MW) – Qenos Peter Armenis (PA) – DP World</p>	<p>NSW EPA Erin Barker (EB)</p> <p>NSW Ports representatives Bryan Beudeker (BB) Jonathan Lafforgue (JL) Peter Munro (PM)</p> <p>Georgia Peters (GP) – Minute taker Roberta Ryan (RR) – Chairperson</p> <p>Apologies: Alan Chambers (AC) – Vopak Gary McKay (GM) – Ampol Mark Bernhardt (MB) – Origin Energy Russell Brown (RB) – ACFS Glen Young (GY) – Port Authority of NSW Creagh de Brabander (CdB) – Elgas Limited Jos Kusters (JK) – Ampol Derrick Quinlivan (DQ) – SafeWork NSW Michael Kinnell (MK) – Origin Energy George Tanevski (GT) – Origin Energy Steve Barclay (SB) / Trent Gearside (TG) – Quantem Dozie Egeonu (DE) – Hutchison</p>

Agenda Items
General Business
<p>1. Welcome, apologies, introductions RR welcomes everyone to the 36th Port Botany CCC meeting. AC, GM, MB and RB are apologies.</p>
Actions arising from previous minutes
<p>1. TfNSW's presentation is to be given at the next meeting. This item is in progress. 2. CH provides information regarding the request to rehabilitate the Sydney Zoo Memorial raised in the previous meeting. CH explains that they are doing upgrades including a new regional playground. The Zoo memorial has been identified in this Plan. Now, there is no</p>

further commitment to the restoration. CH notes that there have been some upgrades in this space recently.

JB is disappointed about the current attitudes around this memorial and says it seems that the “spirit of the 1980s... is out the window.” JB wrote to Bayside Council seeking an update on what Council was planning for the Zoo memorial but had not received a response. JB acknowledged that some remediation work had been done on the concrete animal statues. JB mentioned that this correspondence to Council also recommended that Bayside and Randwick Councils come together to consider options for putting pressure on both NSW Ports and the Port Authority to accept some level of responsibility for the recent beach erosion and environmental damage to the bay.

ACTION: CH asks who he sent this to and says that she will follow it up.

3. PM explains that providing a tour of the Port can be logistically difficult. He says that they do receive requests and they can facilitate small tours. **This is a rolling item, and he has no definitive answer yet.**
4. On the question of LED lighting: there are upgrades in process at the Patrick Terminal and a move toward LED lighting. This is 80% complete. **SS suspects that the lighting is already LED, but he will doublecheck.**

JB notes that there was a discussion at an earlier CCC meeting where the Port Authority said it would install lighting at Foreshore Rd. **ACTION: GY to do a presentation on this item at the next meeting.**

5. Regarding the lighting and condition of Foreshore Rd: CH notes that there will be a follow up with the Consortium about the condition of Foreshore Rd. It has proven difficult to get anything more than a generic response from them, so CH is pursuing this to get a more substantive response. **ACTION: CH to provide a brief status update about the information she finds at the next meeting.**

JB asks who is responsible for Foreshore Rd – State or Council?

CH says that is a state road.

Presentations

2. Noise monitoring and mitigation measures – BB

BB says that he has given a presentation on this topic to the Mayor and certain MPs. He notes that on 27/28 July a ship entered the Port Botany, which led to the most complaints they have ever seen. There were more than 90 complaints. The members of the community with whom he liaised on this issue were very helpful. BB himself went out to listen to ship noises, taking up an invitation provided by residents. He responded to every community member who complained.

BB also noted that the noise from this vessel was extreme and that NSW Ports requested that the vessel did not return to Port Botany until it had taken corrective action to mitigate the noise. BB understood that the ship operator has engaged an acoustic engineer and is in the process of retrofitting a reactive silencer to this vessel, which is an acoustic control that has historically been proven effective on other vessels.

BB notes that weather plays a role on the impact of noise for the community.

BB provides a presentation with slides on the issue.

BB notes that noise management and mitigation is a continual work in progress and they have found that there are two types of ports sounds:

- Ship engines (low frequency)

- Cargo handling, including alarms and beepers (high frequency).

Not all ships are noisy. Around 200 to 300 come through the Port Botany each year, most making little noise and yielding minimal complaints. He notes that occasionally the low frequency noise from the few noisy ships may sound louder indoors than it does outdoors for some residences.

Noise complaints increased during COVID-19 because everyone was working from home and because there was silence with no planes or traffic going past.

“Reactive silencers” on boats auxiliary engines are a potential solution.

BB says if there were no complaints, they wouldn't know that ships are making noises, and neither would the ship operators, so he appreciates complaints and people telling him about the issue.

RR relays a question from PF asks about the alarms. PF thinks the alarms bother the people more than the ship noises. Can they be modified?

BB discusses Landside and cargo handling noise and notes the operation of several alarms on site.

BB has commenced conversations with Patrick, DP World and the container parks about the noises. There are also non-port operations nearby that operate forklifts, which may be responsible for some noises that are not in NSW Ports jurisdiction.

BB advised that one of the container park operators had recently acquired new front-lifters, which came with beepers, and the operator is working through replacing these beepers, which should be completed in the next few weeks.

BB is meeting with Patrick, DP World etc. next week. BB has recordings of the alarms and will be exploring whether the alarms have to be so loud.

PF says he is hearing alarms frequently during night shifts that he does not recall hearing in previous years. PF says beepers are better than they were and the banging of containers have been much reduced.

BB says he has heard these himself. He is trying to understand what these alarms are. There have been some equipment changes, which are the focus of his investigation. He is trying to ascertain which are the problematic alarms.

PF adds that he endorses NSW Ports approach to ships and asks that they continue to make it clear to ship officers and shipowners that they can no longer expect to berth ships with poor noise performance at Port Botany. If Port Botany could work with colleagues at other Australian and New Zealand ports to reinforce that message consistently across the industry, PF thinks it would help to drive badly performing vessels out of the water. PF greatly appreciates the work BB is doing to get to the bottom of the alarm noise epidemic.

BB thanks PF for the feedback and hopes to be able to report some progress on this matter at the next CCC meeting.

RR opens up for questions.

CA notes that if they used two directional noise monitors, you would be able triangulate and get a precise location of the noise source.

BB agrees that this is an effective measure and this why the 'BarnOwl' monitor they use has three noise microphones, which the monitor then uses to triangulate to identify potential noise sources.

CA says that they need something proactive rather than reactive.

BB notes that the container park monitors were doing a good job, but they dropped the ball and now they have had to react to it. He says it is better to react in these situations, rather than not react at all.

JB asks about compliance. Can they institute regulations where, if the vessel does not comply with noise limits, the vessel is not allowed into the Port?

BE comments that there is new zoning applicable to this industrial area. What used to be light industrial is now general industrial. This permits freight transfer facilities, which was not allowed previously.

BB says that there is evidence that they are able to prevent these noises. NSW Ports does not have the authority to regulate or fine noisy facilities at the adjacent industrial area, but they can be regulated through Council and the EPA. BB noted that the feedback received from the container park was apologetic about their noise level and he says he is disappointed that this equipment came in with the beepers and these were not replaced with white noise 'quackers', which would have avoided the additional noise.

ACTION: BB to provide an update about his conversations with Patrick, DP World and the container parks about noise levels, including alarms and so forth.

JL notes that the impact of noise is subjective, there is no hard threshold about what is or isn't acceptable. He adds that the team has adopted a proactive approach in their interactions with shipping lines coming through the Port. In this way, they are able to understand what vessels will be problematic. There are calls made to ship masters and they are also engaging with the highest levels of the organisations to be on top of the issue.

JB thought the administrative authority would be the Port Authority regarding the requirements of vessels.

JL responds that the only way to regulate noise emissions from ships is through the International Maritime Organization (IMO). European ports also have this problem, it is not exclusive to this Port. It has to be tackled through an international regulatory authority.

NSW Ports Business Update

3. Operations update – JL

JL says that this financial year, the Port handled 2.8 million TEU. This is an increase from the year prior. From a refined oil perspective, they handled 864 revenue tonnes through the Port. global liner rates are starting to drop.

JL continues that there has been minimal disruptions to operations and that the Port has been resilient in comparison with Ports globally. He notes that they experienced a big impact with the Omicron variant of COVID-19 during December and January. This impacted whole container lines and truck drivers as well.

NSW Ports monitors the load/discharge ratio of containers on each vessel. For efficiency, the Port believes that a ship coming in full should go out full. He concludes that they are on target.

4. Corporate Affairs update – PM

PM says they will soon be announcing recipients of the community grants. They are looking to make these announcements as early as next week, which will be shared with the CCC. He notes that the recipients are doing terrific things around the relevant LGAs.

NSW Ports is taking a proactive approach to notifying residents about noise issues. This includes sending email notifications or alerts to subscribers whenever the combination of weather conditions and ship movements may exacerbate noise issues. PM encouraged anyone interested in getting these sorts of messages to access the Ports website and under the 'Contact us' page to sign up for Port Botany alerts.

PM continues that the community audit is ongoing. They are looking at community engagement and consultation measures and he notes that some community members from the CCC may be contacted for their feedback. The audit process includes focus groups and phone surveys; it is an

exhaustive and comprehensive process. When they have results to share this will be provided to the CCC.

PM is keen for a presentation from TfNSW on what he calls the “missing link”.

Committee Member Updates

5. Port Authority: Port Botany community assets – GY
6. Port Botany Expansion operational update (Patrick/Hutchison) – GM, DE
7. Tenant developments & round table updates – All & NSW Ports

SS says that they completed Biannual noise monitoring, which is available on their website as of June. The Rail Project is going well, they have 4 sidings, operational to 300 metres. Work is continuing to increase capacity to 600 metres.

PA received 5 ARGTs. They are going through the commissioning stage and improvements have been identified by workers. This is positive news, they can move on redundant equipment and put new ones in the fleet.

8. Vopak update – MM

Nothing to report in this quarter.

9. Opal update – KJ.

Nothing to report in this quarter.

10. EPA update – EB

EB says there is a working group between State government and Industry stakeholders, which she chairs. From this she can attest to the fact that a significant amount of work has been done over the past three years. There have been massive advancements in knowledge. Complaint data provides similar information to the presentation provided by BB, indicating clear peaks in winter. Their analysis is not as detailed as the Ports and they will be doing more work on that. She sees most Port complaints and has seen a huge increase in noise complaints not related to shipping.

Waste regulation has implications for the proposal for sewers. More information is available on the EPA website.

11. The Kamay Project – BE

BE updates that the Kamay Project has been approved, subject to a large number of conditions, which are being worked through. They will have a website and a 1800 complaints number. The project has been quite controversial with some community members. Most of the consent conditions are quite comprehensive, there is a 10-year plan that they have to meet the requirements of.

Comprehensive LEP is going to the Council next week including issues of housing investigations and environmental resilience.

BE adds that they will be moving through the implications of the change of the light industrial zone mentioned earlier. If effected Council would lose power on restricting hours of operation on new developments in the industrial area, which may then permit operations for 24 hours a day. This is likely to increase noise and truck movements, which may affect the amenity of adjacent residential areas.

CA asks about the expansion of the La Perouse ferry wharf. It was originally meant to be 160m long but he understands that it will now be 240m long.

BE says she is not aware to date that they changed the length of the wharf and will look into it.

12. Bayside Council update – CH

There is an upcoming exhibition to Council and Submission to Environment and Planning.

They are continuing to work with the Georges River and Cooks River alliance from a range of working groups. They are both in the first stage of the project (scoping study). They will continue to be part of this.

They are making work with the State Significant Development (SSD) regarding logistics. This will support ports and the airport. This is coming up with the City of Sydney and Inner West councils. They will be discussing impacts on traffic and the amenities of residents. They are also working on tree planting to compensate for the loss of trees in a particular corridor.

Sydney Gateway continues to progress, which will provide an avenue to the Ports.

HSE Update

13. Summary of complaints and incidents – BB
14. Port Botany Expansion Rail Noise (as per CoA 2.28) – BB
15. Biosecurity – BB

Other Business

JB raised the ongoing issue with the exposed Ausgrid cables across the Bay. He has been in contact with multiple people about this issue over the past few months. No one seems to know what is going on with that issue. Lynda Newman is also following up and has written to Planning and EPA which have a role to play here, more so than NSW Ports.

JB made reference to the February CCC meeting when it was mentioned by GY that the Port Authority was intending to review the condition of the Foreshore Rd boat ramp. JB did indicate he was willing to assist with the review from a ramp user perspective and had written to GY but had received no reply. **ACTION: CH will follow this up.**

CA said the Council gave a presentation at the Precinct meeting, about boat moorings in Frenchman's Bay being removed. The yacht was submerged as a result of a failed salvage operation.

ACTION: BE to investigate the extension of the La Perouse ferry wharf.

PM-BCC is concerned about disturbances in the area on the other side of the port, including boats and people fishing. They are operating separately from Council.

Next Meeting

Tuesday, 22nd November 2022

5:30pm – 7:00 pm

Location: Zoom